



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,583	08/31/2001	Andrew Robinson	1581.0840001/RWE	9616
26111	7590	01/05/2004	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MINNIFIELD, NITA M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1645	18	
DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/942,583	ROBINSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
N. M. Minnifield	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2003 and 23 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 19 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 19, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8/31/01.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 10.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

3. Claims 1-8, 19, 22 and 23 have been examined.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers (United Kingdom (9904028.9 UK) filed 2/22/99, in United Kingdom (9922561.7 UK) filed 9/23/99 and PCT/GB00/000624 filed 2/22/00) have been placed of record in the file.
6. Claims 1-8, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are vague and indefinite in the recitation of "a heterologous gene product" (see line 2 of claim 1 for example). Does Applicant intend this heterologous gene product to be the isolated protein that is expressed in the expression vector that is in the commensal *Neisseria*? Or does Applicant intend this product to be the commensal *Neisseria* itself, which has the heterologous gene product? If Applicant intends the former, amendment to the claims to indicate that the "composition comprises an *isolated* heterologous gene product" is needed. Further, with regard to the claims, step (d) of claim 1, for example, recites "obtaining said heterologous gene product from the *Neisseria* of (c)"; however it is not clear how this heterologous

gene product is obtained. Does Applicant intend that the heterologous gene product is actually isolated from the commensal *Neisseria*? Clarification is requested. Claim 3 lacks positive antecedent basis in the recitation of "product of a gene from a pathogenic *Neisseria*", see line 2. Claim 1 recites "product of a gene of a pathogenic *Neisseria*". With regard to claim 5, how does one know that you are obtaining the heterologous gene product when the commensal *Neisseria* cells are suspending in detergent and then incubate the suspension so as to extract a protein fraction from the cell? Does Applicant intend that any protein extracted by suspending in detergent and subsequent incubation will be the heterologous gene product; commensal *Neisseria* normally have proteins that are extracted via use of detergent incubation.

The above 112, second paragraph rejection applies to claims 1-8, 19, 22 and 23.

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 19 and 23 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 34 and 39-41 of copending Application No. 10/185769. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications have claims directed to a composition comprising the same or similar components.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. No claims are allowed.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to N. M. Minnifield whose telephone number is 703-305-3394 (571-272-0860 after January 26, 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette R.F. Smith can be reached on 703-308-3909 (571-272-0866 after January 26, 2004). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



N. M. Minnifield

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1645

NMM

December 23, 2003